♠ JS 44 (Rev. 12/07) (cand rev 1-16-08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Document 1

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDA	NTS					
Kuljinder Singh				Michael Chertoff; Emilio T. Gonzalez; Michael B. Mukasey						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Northumberland (P. (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			'A)	NOTE: IN	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nar	ne, Address, and Telephon	e Number)		Attorneys (If K	Attorneys (If Known)					
Robert B. Jobe, Law Office of Robert B. Jobe 550 Kearny Street, Suite 200 San Francisco, CA 94108 (415) 956-5513				United State 450 Golden San Francisc	Gate Av	e., 9th F	ce 1.			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in (One Box Only)	III. C	CITIZENSHIP	OF PR	INCIP	AL PARTIES			
U.S. Government 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)			Ci	(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1						
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of	of Parties in Item III)	Ci	tizen of Another State	2	2	of Business In TI Incorporated and Prin of Business In A	cipal Place	□ 5	5
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			Ci	tizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<u></u> 3	<u></u>	Foreign Nation		☐ 6	<u></u> 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT CONTRACT										***************************************
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 440 Other Civil Rights	PERSONAL IN. 362 Personal Inju Med. Malpra 365 Personal Inju Product Liab 368 Asbestos Per Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROF 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lend 380 Other Persona Property Dana 385 Property Dana Product Liabi PRISONEI PETITION 510 Motions to Va Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conditi	JURY ITY— ictice ITY— ility sonal ct PERTY ling al large lity R S C Other ion	FORFEITURE/P 610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & 625 Drug Related 625 Drug Related 630 Liquor Laws 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor State 720 Labor/Mgmt. & Disclosure 730 Labor/Mgmt. & Disclosure 740 Railway Labo 790 Other Labor L 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 520 Security Act 1MMIGRATI 462 Naturalization A 463 Habeas Corpu Alien Detaine 465 Other Immigra Actions	Drug Scizure Scizure L1 USC 88 andards Relations Reporting Act r Act citigation ON pplication e	422 423	IAL SECURITY IIA (1395ff) Black Lung (923)	400 St 410 A 430 Bt 450 Cc 460 Dc 470 Rc 480 Cc 480 Cc 480 Cc 480 Cc 875 Cu 891 Ag 892 Ec 893 En 894 En 895 Fro 895 Fro 600 Cu 490 Cc 895 Cc 600 Cc	anks and Ban ommerce eportation acketeer Influ orrupt Organi onsumer Cred able/Sat TV lelective Servic curities/Com achange istomer Chall t USC 3410 her Statutory pricultural Ac- onomic Stabi vironmental I ergy Allocati eedom of Infe	ionment iking lenced and izations lit ce modities/ lenge Actions ts litzation Act Matters on Act permation
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i 2 Remov Proceeding State C		ate Court	Reinstat Reopen	ted or 5 anot ed (spec	ify)	t	6 Multidistrict Litigation	□ 7 J N	ppeal to Di udge from lagistrate udgment	strict
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	5 USC 701 et al. Brief description of ca	iuse:		ms (no not cue lu	irisaictio	nai statu	tes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CASE(S)	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER F.R.C.P. 22 PLEASE REFER	3 TO CIVIL L.R. 3-1		DEMAND \$ CERNING REQU	IREME	NT TO F	CHECK YES JURY DEMA		nanded in co	
IF ANY IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNM	ENT (CIVIL L.R. 3-2) (
PLACE AND "X" IN ONE IDATE $28/8/08$	BOX ONLY)	SIGNATURE OF A	SAN FI	RANCISCO/OAI	KLAND		□ SAN JOSE			

1 2 3 4	Robert B. Jobe (Cal. State Bar #133089) LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT B. JOBE 550 Kearny Street, Suite 200 San Francisco, CA 94108 Tel: (415) 956-5513 Fax: (415) 840-0308 Email: bob@jobelaw.com	Section of the sectio	NORTHSK US	ORIGINAL B - 8 2008 D W. WIEKING NOT OF CALIFORNIA		
5	Attorney for Plaintiff.	Sentence (O'N DIST.	DISTRICT COURT		
6				ALIFORNIA		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE					
8	NORTHERN DISTRIC	CT OF C	ALIFORNIA	CA		
9	KULJINDER SINGH,)				
10	Plaintiff,	Ó	No.			
11	v.		08	0880		
12	MICHAEL CHERTOFF, SECRETARY,)	COMPLAINT FO			
13	DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; EMILIO T. GONZALEZ, DIRECTOR; U.S.)	UNDER THE AD PROCEDURE AC	MINISTRATIVE CT		
14	CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICE MICHAEL MUKASEY, U.S. ATTORNEY	S;))	DHS Alien Numbe	er: 95-605-299		
15	GENERAL,)				
16	Defendants.)				
17	COMPLANTEDOD DELL'AND					
18	COMPLAINT FOR RELIEF UNDER THE					
19	By and through his undersigned attorney, P	laintiff K	ULJINDER SINGH	H ("Mr. Singh"), as		
20	for his complaint, alleges as follows:					
21	PROCEDURAL	L HISTO	<u>ORY</u>			
22	1. Mr. Singh is a native and citizen of	India wl	ho entered the U.S. 1	near Phoenix,		
23	Arizona without inspection on or about June 4, 200					
	Application for Asylum (Form I-589) with U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service. He					
24						
25	¹ Pursuant to the Department of Homeland Security Reorganization Plan, Homeland					
26	Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002), 6 U.S.C. §§ 101-557, as of March 1, 2003, the INS was abolished and its functions were transferred to the Department of					
27	Plaintiff's Complaint For Relief	-0440 4401	o maniferrou to the			
28	Under the Administrative Procedure Act					

Plaintiff's Complaint For Relief Under the Administrative Procedure Act

Homeland Security ("DHS").

- attended an asylum interview in San Francisco, California on November 6, 2002.
- 2. On an unknown date, the San Francisco Asylum Office issued Mr. Singh a letter, indicating that he was "previously informed that [his] Request for Asylum was **recommended for approval** pending receipt by the [government] of the results of a mandatory, confidential investigation of [his] identity and background." (Emphasis added). The letter further indicated that while running the background checks, the asylum office learned that Mr. Singh was arrested on July 5, 2002 in Salt Point, New York, for unlawfully dealing with a child and sale of alcohol to a minor, and therefore requested the final court disposition in that case to be submitted within 60 days.
- 3. On December 13, 2002, Mr. Singh's prior attorney, Mohinder Singh, sent a letter to the asylum office attaching a letter from Mr. Singh's criminal defense attorney, which indicated that the charges stemming from the July 2002 arrest of "Surrinder Singh" were Adjourned in Contemplation of Dismissal, such that at the end of a six-month period, the charges would be dismissed provided there was no further trouble with the law. Mohinder Singh indicated in his cover letter that Mr. Singh was "also known as Surrinder Singh." On January 3, 2003, Mr. Singh mailed the asylum office a copy of the "Certificate of Disposition," which indicated that "Surinder Singh" was granted an Adjournment in Contemplation of Dismissal on November 25, 2002 in the Town of Dover Court, in Dover Plains, New York, related to the July 2002 arrest.
- 4. Over four years later, on May 30, 2007, the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") mailed a letter to Mr. Singh at "188-15 Cavendish Dr., Castro Valley, CA 94552," stating:

Immigration records indicate that you were previously placed in deportation, exclusion, or removal proceedings. Asylum regulations provide that only an immigration judge may adjudicate the asylum application of an individual in proceedings before an immigration court. See 8 CFR 208.2(b). Therefore, the asylum office does not have jurisdiction to consider your asylum application. Your asylum application cannot be processed by the asylum office at this time.

1	7
2	iı
3	t]
4	
5	E
6	S
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	re
16	U
17	re
18	01
19	72
20	(<i>P</i>
21	by
22	Ju

The letter then provided the address of the San Francisco Immigration Court for "further nformation." Mr. Singh was not given any opportunity to challenge the asylum office's finding hat he had previously been placed in removal proceedings, a fact that he firmly denies.

USCIS sent Mr. Singh another letter on October 2, 2007, to "209 Main Street, 5. Blossburg, PA 16912," denying his Application for Employment Authorization (Form I-765), and tating that:

USCIS records show that you filed a Form I-589 on September 12, 2002. A review of the records indicates that your asylum application was administratively closed on May 23, 2007 by the San Francisco Asylum Office. The Asylum Office did not have jurisdiction over your asylum application because you were in proceedings before the Immigration Judge.

The results of your proceedings show that you were ordered removed from the United States by order of the Immigration Judge on March 22, 1999.

The USCIS has no record that you have a pending asylum application. For that reason, your Application for Employment Authorization (Form I-765) is denied.

There are no provisions in USCIS regulations that allow for an appeal from this decision.

Upon learning that his asylum application was terminated, a confused Mr. Singh 6. etained undersigned, who promptly filed a Freedom of Information Request ("FOIA"). Indersigned received the FOIA request on January 7, 2008, which revealed numerous documents elated to other individuals, including a March 22, 1999 Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA" r "Board") decision, affirming the denial of an asylum claim in the case of "Surrender Singh" (A 2-764-131) and a March 8, 2000 in absentia removal order related to a "Surinder Singh Wahla" A 73-427-486). Mr. Singh maintains that he is not the same individual whose case was dismissed y the BIA in 1999 or the individual who was ordered removed by a San Francisco Immigration adge in 2000. At the time these decisions were being rendered, in 1999 and 2000, Mr. Singh was not even in the United States.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction over the subject matter of this civil action is conferred on this Court by 7. 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as a civil action arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United

23

24

25

26

27

28

States; 28 U.S.C. § 1361, as a civil action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or
employee of the United States to perform a duty owed to Plaintiff; 5 U.S.C. § 702, as a challenge
to agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"); and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and
2202, as a civil action seeking, in addition to other remedies, a declaratory judgment.
<u>VENUE</u>
8. Venue is properly in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(e)(2) and (e)(3),
because a substantial part of the events giving rise to this claim occurred in this district and no real
property is involved in this action.
INTRA-DISTRICT ASSIGNMENT
9. Because a substantial portion of the events that gave rise to this lawsuit occurred
in the County of San Francisco, this case should be assigned to the Court's San Francisco
division.
<u>STANDING</u>
10. The APA affords a right of review to a person who is "adversely affected or
aggrieved by agency action." 5 U.S.C. § 702. Defendants' illegal action has immeasurably
prolonged Mr. Singh's ability to legalize his status in the United States.
<u>PLAINTIFF</u>
11. Mr. Singh is a native and citizen of India who resides at "143 Main Street, Apt. #2
Watsontown, PA 17777." Although Mr. Singh filed an asylum application on September 12,
2002, USCIS refused to adjudicate it based on its belief that Mr. Singh had been ordered removed
in 1999 by the San Francisco Immigration Court - something that Mr. Singh vehemently denies.
Accordingly, Mr. Singh continues to remain in legal limbo.
DEFENDANTS
12. Respondent, Michael Chertoff, is sued in his official capacity as the Secretary of
the United States Department of Homeland Security ("DHS"). In that capacity, he has
responsibility for the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws pursuant to 8

2 3

1

- 4
- 5 6
- 7
- 8 9
- 10
- 11 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26

//

- 27
- 28
- Plaintiff's Complaint For Relief Under the Administrative Procedure Act

- DHS, encompassing USCIS, is the executive department "responsible for 13. providing immigration-related services and benefits such as naturalization and work authorization as well as investigative and enforcement responsibilities for enforcement of federal immigration laws, customs laws, and air security laws." See http://www.dhs.gov/ximgtn/.
- Emilio T. Gonzalez is the Director of USCIS and, as such, has been delegated 14. the authority to direct the administration of USCIS, and to enforce the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA") and all other laws relating to the immigration and naturalization of noncitizens. Defendant Gonzalez is sued herein in his official capacity.
- USCIS is the federal agency within DHS that is responsible for the administration 15. and enforcement of the INA and all other laws relating to the immigration and naturalization of non-citizens.
- Respondent, Michael Mukasey, is sued in his official capacity as the Attorney 16. General of the United States. He retains certain responsibilities for administration and enforcement of the immigration laws pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1103.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act)

- Plaintiff repeats, allege, and incorporate paragraphs 1 through 16 above as though 17. fully set forth herein.
- Plaintiff is a person aggrieved by agency action under the Administrative 18. Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 701 et seq. By failing to adjudicate the application for asylum filed by Mr. Singh or even give Mr. Singh an opportunity to contest their belief that he had been ordered removed from the United States under another name, Defendants have acted arbitrarily and capriciously and have "unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed" agency action in violation of 5 U.S.C. § 706.

1	RELIEF REQUESTED					
2	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff pray that this Court:					
3	(1) Accept jurisdiction over this action;					
4	(2) Declare Defendants' failure to adjudicate the application for asylum filed by Mr.					
5	Singh to be a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and 28 U.S.C. § 1361;					
6	(3) Grant attorney's fees and costs of court under 28 U.S.C. § 2412, 28 U.S.C. §					
7	1920, Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d), and other authority; and					
8	(4) Grant such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper under the					
9	circumstances.					
10	DATED: February 8, 2008 Respectfully submitted,					
11						
12	Robert B. Jobe, Esq.					
13	LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT JOBE 550 Kearny Street, Suite 200					
14	San Francisco, CA 94108 (415) 956-5513					
15	(415) 840-0308					
16	Attorney for Plaintiff					
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26 27						
~ /						